	Case 2:11-cv-00584-SRB Document	32 Filed 07/01/11 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
8		
9	George M. Walker, et ux.) No. CV 11-0584-PHX-SRB
10	Plaintiffs,	ORDER
11	vs.	
12	Washington Mutual Bank, F.A., et al.	
13		
14	Defendants.)
15		_
16	On June 30, 2011, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint for	
17	Quiet Title. Because the Plaintiffs are acting pro se in this matter, the Court advises the	
18	Plaintiffs of the following:	
19	I. RULE 7.2(i) CAUTIONARY NOTICE	
20	LRCiv 7.2(i) states in relevant part: "[I]f the opposing party does not serve and file the	
21	required answering memoranda such non-compliance may be deemed a consent to the	
22	denial or granting of the motion and the Court may dispose of the motion summarily." See	
23	D.Ariz. R. 1.10(i); see also Brydges v. Lewis, 18 F.3d 651, 652 (9th Cir. 1994). Plaintiffs	
24	should take notice that failure to respond to the Defendants' Motion by the deadline set forth	
25	in this Order will result in the Court deeming the Defendants' Motion as being unopposed and	
26	consented to by the Plaintiffs. See Brydges, 18 F.3d at 652 (affirming the district court's	
27	summary granting of a motion for summary judgment under Local Rule 7.2(i) when	
28	non-moving party was given express warr	ning of consequences of failing to respond).

It is the Plaintiffs obligation to timely respond to all motions. The Defendants' Motion will be summarily granted if Plaintiffs fail to respond in accordance with the provisions of this Order.

II. RULE 41 CAUTIONARY NOTICE

The Plaintiffs should also take notice that if they fail to timely comply with every provision of this Order, or any other order of the Court entered in this matter, their Complaint and this action may also be dismissed pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992) (holding that the district court may dismiss an action for failure to comply with any order of the court), *cert denied*, 506 U.S. 915 (1992). Therefore, the Plaintiffs are warned that failure to strictly adhere to the provisions of this or any other Court Order will result in dismissal of the Plaintiffs' Complaint pursuant to Rule 41.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiffs shall file with the Clerk of the Court and serve on opposing counsel a responsive memorandum to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint **no later than July 18, 2011.**

DATED this 1st day of July, 2011.

Susan R. Bolton United States District Judge